

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed January 11, 2008 regarding the subject application.

By that action, claims 151-154 and 159 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goerl. Claims 106-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerl in view of Horner. Claims 117-149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerl in view of Horner and the German reference DE 33 39 848. Claim 156-158 and 160 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerl in view of FR 2 446 097.

In response, the applicants have amended the claims for clarification purposes and believe that the claims as now amended are patentably distinctive over the cited references for the reasons to be discussed hereinbelow.

All of the cited references have been discussed in detail in the applicant's previous communications. Accordingly, the applicant will direct their comments to what they believe to be the distinguishing features in view of the Examiner's most recent remarks.

In respect to independent claims 106, 117 and 151, the applicants believe that the recited features with respect to the interface of the vessel and the top housing are substantially different from those features of the Goerl reference. That is, in the Goerl reference, the member 16 has a front turned bead 53 that engages the portion 32 or portion 22 of the pan 12. It should be recognized that these portions 22 and 32 are underside surfaces of the respective rims 24 and 34 of the pans 12 and 13. The rims 24 and 34 are clearly at the top end of the pans 12 and 13, and therefore the surfaces 22 and 32 are associated with the top ends of the pans 12 and 13. It is there rims 22 and 32 which interface with the outturned bend 53 at the top of the top housing. Each of the pans 12 and 13 have a downwardly extending portion (23 for pan 12 and 33 for pan 13) which connect to the respective bottoms 21 and 31. Thus, each of the pans 12 and 13 interface with the outturned bead 53 at the top member 16 near the upper ends

thereof and have a major portion of the pan extending down into the member 16. It would appear from the description that the purpose is to allow the heat to flow not only the bottoms 21 and 31 but also over the side surfaces 23 and 33. This is substantially different from the applicant's invention where the heat is preferably directed to the lower end of the vessel so that the attached protrusion can most effectively transfer the heat from the burner to the vessel.

Referring now to the claims, each of the independent claims 106, 117 and 151 recite a vessel having a top and bottom end, and a top housing having a top rim coupled circumferentially to the external bottom end of the vessel. This structure allows for the heat from the burner to rise up through the top housing and be directed entirely to the bottom side of the bottom end so as to take full advantage of the protrusions rather than having the heat distributed over the sides of the vessel as would be the case with the Goerl reference.

For these reasons, the applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are patentably distinctive over the cited references. A reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and a passing of the case to issue is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0289, under Order No. 1323_001RCE from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Dana F. Bigelow/
Dana F. Bigelow
Registration No.: 26,441
MARJAMA MULDOON BLASIAK &
SULLIVAN LLP
250 South Clinton Street
Suite 300
Syracuse, New York 13202
(315) 425-9000
Customer No.: 20874